UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,219	10/03/2006	Ulrike Schulz	P29299	2157
	7590 02/01/201 & BERNSTEIN, P.L.	EXAMINER		
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE			KARPINSKI, LUKE E	
RESTON, VA 20191			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/01/2011	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com pto@gbpatent.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/574,219	SCHULZ ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
LUKE E. KARPINSKI	1616	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 11 January 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time
periods: a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL  2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of the date of the lind of the l
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  AMENDMENTS
<ul> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because         <ul> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☐ Other:
/Johann R. Richter/ 1/26/2011 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1616

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments filed 1/11/2011 has been fully considered but are not found persuasive. Applicant argues that Banowski teaches an unreasonable number of compositions and do not teach mandelic acid as a preferred component. This argument is not found persuasive because Banowski teaches a reasonable number of embodiments and there is no requirement that Banowski teach a component as preferred in order to render the use of said component as obvious. Applicant also argues that Banowski teaches a broad range for a:b ratios and the examples provided are different from the claimed ratios by a factor of 2.7. This argument is not found persuasive because Banowski teaches a range which encompasses the claimed range. Applicant also argues that Shen teaches hydroxycarboxylic acids having 6 carbons or less and one would not replace said acids with mandelic acid which has 8 carbon atoms. This argument is not found persuasive because Shen teaches the use of hydroxycarboxylic acids and the teachings of Yu provide the motivation to add mandelic acid to the formulations of Shen. Applicant also argues that Shen requires a soluble Ca salt and Ca mandalate is only slightly soluble. This argument is not found persuasive because even though Ca mandalate is slightly soluble that still reads on soluble and there is no evidence that the use of Ca and mandelic acid would result in Ca mandalate. While the examiner agrees that in a simple aqueous formulation said precipitate would form, in complex gel emulsions, as taught in Shen, there is no way to determine if said precipitation would take place due to the gel structure and plurality of additional components found within the composition.